DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 931 EA 013 458

AUTHOR Butterfield, Dennie
TITLE Relevance and Curriculum: Making the Five R's Meaningful.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Regional Conference of the International Reading Association (5th, Boise, ID, November 6-8, 1980). Some paragraphs may not reproduce clearly due to broken print of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Board of Education Role; *Community Involvement; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; *Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; Selection; *Student Participation; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

In response to increasingly vigorous and vocal criticism of American education, the author proposes a new model for curriculum development--a double triad that would combine the traditional cooperative efforts of administrators, teachers, and school board members with involvement of the community, parents, and students. The author suggests procedures for selection and involvement of community, parent, and student representatives on a community curriculum revision committee. In addition, he discusses the participation of teachers, the school board, and administrators. Guidelines for translating statements of philosophy and goals into performance objectives and for designing evaluation procedures are also included. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199931

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D D Butterfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Relevance and Curriculum: Making the Five R's Meaningful

Dr. Dennie Butterfield, Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
Brigham Young University

Most fads and innovations fade from the educational setting without having made measured impact on student learning.

One of the major criticisms of today's American school curriculum stems from those dissatisfied with "the way it is." They regard the standard curriculum as sterile, lifeless, coercive, indifferent to the actual lives of children and youth, and blind to the problems of the times.[1]

As early as Plato and Comenius, the curriculum of the schools has been subject to change. It is true, however, that the history of educational innovations has typically reflected the forces of change brought about through a degree of dissatisfaction with the existing social order. Butts revealed that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, American schools moved inexorably toward universal public education because of the rejection of the influence of European aristocracy.[2]

Although sweeping changes occurred in the development of educational thought, it was a gradual process which ultimately brought the emergence of curriculum as a recognized field of specialization. It was not until the end of World War II, however, that American schools were ready for sweeping curriculum changes. The country had just emerged from sixteen years of economic depression and war. During that period of time we had lost sight of education as a force for societal welfare and had neglected our schools. Wartime testing of servicemen had revelaed an alarming lack of scientific and mathematical comprehension among our school graduates. As a result of these findings parents and society began to express concerns which caused the initiation of vast curricular reform in our school system.[3]

Fears over the ability of American science and technology to compete with the Russians were reinforced with the launching of the Russian Sputnik in 1957. Demands for change became a new source of American social concern which sought an appropriate scapegoat. The advent of the space age created deep dissatisfaction with the existing social order forcing schools to adapt and initiate dramatic changes in the existing curriculum. Those changes led education to the "alphabet" curriculum of the fifties and early sixties.

By the late sixties Americans became further concerned that the discipline-oriented "alphabet" curriculum was not meeting the grim realities of society. Because of an increased awareness of the human and social problems facing youth, students, ethnic, and disadvantaged groups, the "system" was rejected by those who felt alienated. Dissatisfaction with the existing social order once again found its scapegoat in educational institutions. This dissatisfaction was expressed in cries of concern for the needs of all students in the schools and in the seeming lack of relevance of the traditional curriculum.

EA 013 458

★ International Reading Assn. — Rocky Mt. Regional Conf. — 1980

In order to meet the needs dictated by such powerful social forces, education attempted to initiate changes which would more fully accomplish the goals dictated by powerful pressure groups, militant groups within our society, bestselling books, federal and state legislation, as well as those recognized as essential by the profession itself. Variables such as finances, legal requirements and limitations, and time constraint made the empirical measure of the actual effect of change extremely difficult. Education, in general, was prone to deal with its most complex problems in terms of fads, slogans, bandwagonism, and hit-or-miss techniques in developing, implementing, and evaluating the effects of change. In the past twenty years it has become fashionable for schools to adopt "new" innovative trends and practices such as open-space classrooms, team teaching, behavioral objectives, nongrading, programmed instruction, discovery teaching, and accountability in the name of curriculum reform. These changes have been viewed as either necessary to meet public demands on the schools or as the ultimate panacea for all educational concerns and needs.

We have failed to heed the words of Rugg who stated, "It is most important that those constructing our school curriculum shall maintain an overview of the total situation."[4] This perspective was further emphasized by Goodlad in his statement, "Perhaps through an evolutionary process profiting from awareness of the past and especially from strengths and weaknesses in earlier curriculum efforts we will both produce improved curriculum materials and advance the study of curriculum."[5]

Most fads and innovations fade from the educational setting without having made measured impact on student learning. Those who control such change seemingly fail to recognize the need for measuring its effect on the student. They fail to learn from their own past experiences and from those of others. As a result education has continually looked for the ultimate solution for educational needs in the next bandwagon.

This approach to curriculum change is always pursued without the utilization of empirical evaluation devices which will reveal the educational benefits of one program over the measured student learning of a different approach. Evaluation is much like apple pie and motherhood. No one is actually against it. Educators have always lauded the need for evaluation and taken steps to evaluate their own students, instructional efforts, textbooks, and instructional programs. The evaluation procedures used, however, have been seen as worthwhile, and have not been used from the scientific viewpoint required to obtain valid data as a basis for future curriculum decisions. Popham stated that:

> In fact, writers who have seriously considered the responsibilities of educators to evaluate their own activities have generally concluded that the necessity to evaluate represents an ethical, if not moral, responsibility for the educator. But, unfortunately, until the 1960's and 1970's we find little evidence that the frequently voiced praise for educational evaluation has led to any substantial increase in the occurrence of evaluation activities carried out by educators. Vocal support of evaluation has been present in abundance. Actual educational evaluations, at least of a systematic sort, have been rare indeed.[6]

With current public dissatisfaction with education, we can no longer afford to postpone the need for scientific evaluation of our educational efforts. "The honeymoon is over."[7] People no longer accept the belief that education is flawless. This critical attitude is revealed most dramatically in the Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools conducted annually by George H. Gallup. With the major findings determined each year by the poll, the public is demonstrating an increased concern and awareness of school curriculum. They have listed as one of their major concerns "poor curriculum." Parents are also showing an increasing level of knowledge about the schools as well as a desire for the curriculum to place greater emphasis on the fundamentals, higher scholastic standards, more parental involvement in school activities, and closer teacher/parent relationships. The revealed need for greater emphasis on the basics has support throughout the nation and has already caused many changes for increased emphasis on reading, writing, and arithmetic.[8]

Summary. Contemporary critics of American education are becoming increasingly vigorous and vocal. Even though their concerns have produced changes, it is the manner and degree of such change which have produced even more criticism. These criticisms may be summarized as (1) lack of involvement by those concerned and directly affected in the actual planning and implementation of educational change; (2) lack of measures which would assure curricular relevance to actual proven needs before final implementation of educational change; (3) need for valid and reliable measures which would provide empirical data to justify proposed innovation and change; and (4) willingness of education to be accountable for student learning and mastery of the basics.

Involvement, relevance, evaluation, and accountability are the chief needs to which critics have addressed themselves. Although the emphasis in education is causing us to readdress the basic R's in the five dimensions, it is the sixth dimension of relevance through involvement, evaluation, and accountability which will ultimately provide assurance, validity and success in the dimensions of reading, writing, arithmetic, arts, and resources.

Involvement as an Approach to Greater Relevance

If curriculum is to become a viable force of relevancy, its development and implementation must involve those who are concerned with and will be directly affected by proposed changes. Historically, curriculum changes have been the responsibility of the school administration and teachers who develop and implement change through policies enacted by the local school board. This triad, acting on behalf of students, were the decision-making arbiters who determined educational change in a given school system.

In the application of a model which would involve all segments of the community, it would be necessary to enlarge the triad to include the community, parents, and students. This enlargement would effect the creation of a new model for curriculum: a double triad, which would involve all segments of the society directly influenced by curricular change.

The double triad approach to involvement and decision-making would further serve to place a high level of responsibility on every segment of the school community for the development, implementation, and quality of the educational program. This responsibility would evolve into accountability when each segment realized and accepted its role in the educational process through its involvement in curriculum development. Through this involvement, greater understanding and support of the educational endeavor would also develop.

The question then remains as to the actual procedures which would insure the required level of participation, involvement, support, acceptance of responsibility, and accountability.

The Community Curriculum Revision Committee

In order for curriculum revision to be relevant and accountable, those who are directly affected must be involved in the process of change. In the revision process those who have not been traditionally involved would be listed and defined as:

1. Community-Those who reside within a community who represent business concerns, service organizations, political, religious, and socio-economic leaders or groups, representatives from governmental organizations, retired individuals, recent high school graduates, and others who contribute to school financing through the existing tax structures and do not have an interest primarily motivated by children enrolled in the school system.

2. Parents-Those who reside within the school district boundaries and have children attending schools,

3. Students-Those currently attending schools in the district.

Selection and Involvement of Community Representatives

Although the selection of community representatives to serve on a curriculum revision committee is difficult, careful organization will provide a procedure inclusive enough to reach all segments of the non-parent population. Selection procedures would be outlined as:

1. Personal contact by school board members, administrators and teachers, and involved parents and parent groups with community leaders. This contact would include a request that they participate in the districtwide curriculum revision committee. For those leaders who have large business or organizational concerns who cannot participate, it would be well to request they assign a representative to be involved.

2. Implementation of an intensive local news media campaign. The media would outline the goals and purposes of the revision committee. This publicity would then encourage participation by all interested citizens.

3. Personal invitation given to representatives of the local news media. Their direct involvement would lead to greater coverage and community insight into the actual revision process.

Selection and Involvement of Parent Representatives

Although the logical medium for parent selection would be the local school PTA groups, care should be given to provide the same level of personal contact involved in the selection of community representatives. Emphasis should further be given to extending personal invitations to parents not involved in the PTA, especially to those known to be critical of the schools and their programs. PTA representation has traditionally involved more women than men. Care should be taken to have a representative number of fathers participate in the curriculum revision process.

Selection and Involvement of Student Representatives

One of the essential elements in developing relevance in curriculum reform is the involvement of students. Previous experience has proven that students are concerned and capable of providing meaningful insight into curriculum revision needs. Although most students who participate should be selected by their peers, careful consideration should be given to further involvement of others acknowledged by students and teachers as leaders and scholars, as well as of a level of maturity required for such participation. Student representatives from grade levels and schools throughout the district should be involved either at a district level (if the district is small) or a building level on a regular, scheduled basis. Students from grades three through twelve have participated in the revision process in a meaningful and successful manner.

Teacher/Staff Selection and Involvement

A major areas of concern increasingly emphasized by professional organizations and school employees is that of the need for a greater degree of self-determination. Those involved in the actual instructional process feel they should have a greater role in the decision making which eventuates in changes that affect them at the teaching level. Such involvement would further provide a liaison between teachers and the administration, school board, parents, community, and students.

The selection of teachers for participation on the district curriculum revision committee should be organized and implemented by the teachers from each school throughout the district. Experience has revealed that at least one representative from each grade level (primary, intermediate, and upper) in the district elementary schools, and one from each subject-matter area from junior and senior high schools in the district will provide adequate and meaningful teacher input in the curriculum revision process.

Others who should be involved in this process are representatives from district and school building support personnel as well as representatives of the classified staff. Their insight and involvement is essential in any changes proposed. It is their support at the classroom and building level which will insure the success or failure of any changes implemented.

School Board Involvement

The role of the school board in the curriculum revision process involves five distinct responsibilities. The steps involving the school board would be (1) authorization for committee involvement and for expenditures of funds necessary to develop and establish a community consensus of a district statement of philosophy, goals, specific program objectives, and district priorities; (2) organization of the necessary steps which would assure the selection and attraction of a true cross-section of involved community representatives; (3)adoption of district policies relating to approved committee recommendations for district philosophy statements, goals, program objectives, and district priorities; (4) review all recommendations forthcoming as a result of committee findings and efforts; (5) implementation of adopted recommendations through further policies which would provide the necessary administrative mandate and organizational framework.

In order to assure thorough board understanding of committee progress and accomplishments, selected board member(s) should participate throughout the entire process as interested parents or private citizens and not as elected representatives of the community.

Administration Involvement

The administrative staff of each school and district administrative personnel should also be involved in this revision process. This involvement of the building administrator provides leadership and communication between the community and student groups while district administrators provide needed liaison between the committee, district superintendent, and school board. Both levels of administration should work together in analyzing and anticipating problems which might develop. Those involved in leadership roles should act as moderators and resources for information. Administrators should stress the need that most revision work should actually come from teachers, parents, community, and students. Their leadership role should further be to provide stimulation and motivation and to insure the continued participation of each member of the committee. Particular care should be taken to conduct meetings kept open to various points of view. No special interest group should be allowed to dominate or intimidate. Procedures to prevent such occurrences should be established by administrators who will be involved in conducting meetings and then they should be initiated as needed.

Implementation Procedures for Committee Involvement

There is a need for development of educational programs at the local level. This local participation and development may be accomplished through the guidance of competent and experienced educators and citizens. While much good can come from a properly organized and effectively utilized advisory committee, it is the carefully organized committee which contributes to districts who have a need for community support in a positive and meaningful way. The successful community advisory group can contribute significantly toward the improvement of (1) home, school, and community relations; (2) parent, community, and student understanding of school curriculum and teaching strategies; (3) staff understanding of parent

opinions and attitudes toward the school; (4) joint exploration and improvement of future school needs; (5) community support for the goals of the school; and (6) opportunity for parents to express their opinions of school programs.

If these desirable results are to be realized, however, there are certain basic guidelines which must be implemented and followed throughout the revision process.

After the selection of those who will serve on the curriculum revision committee, the next step is to outline procedures to be followed during the meetings. These procedures may be divided into six distinct phases listed as follows:

1. Development of a schedule which will assign times and locations of meetings to be held.

2. The development of a district philosophy and goal statements.

   a. Ranking on a priority basis of district goals.
   b. Clear statement of philosophy

3. Bringing together selected representatives from each committee.

   a. Revision made as required as a result of joint meetings.

4. Writing programs and performance objectives (by the professional staff) related to the prioritized district goals.

5. Development of instructional programs within prescribed resources as recommended by the committee.

6. Development and implementation of evaluation procedures which will provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of program of instruction and of student learning success.

Scheduling Meetings

Any meeting of more than 60 people becomes difficult to manage and defeats the purposes of the community involvement process. Too large a group inhibits interaction and discussion, seriously limits time for each member to express personal concerns, and slows feedback that keeps each member informed of group findings and committee progress. It is recommended, therefore, that several school sites be selected with meetings scheduled at different times during the week, thus allowing representatives to attend the meetings which fit their schedules.

Experience has shown that the initial meetings can last until a late hour if held during the evening. For this reason it is preferable that students be involved in curriculum revision during the day at a school site convenient to several schools. Students meeting with each other at this stage would encourage greater group participation and interaction among their peers. Other meetings may be scheduled during the day for those who can attend them.

District Philosophy, Goal Statements, and Prioritization of Goals

At the initial meeting of each group a carefully prepared learning activity should be initiated which would clearly and concisely outline the objectives to be accomplished by the committee, the rules for operating, and the degree and limitation of the committee authority. Members should also be informed of the anticipated completion date and at what point their function will shift from curriculum revision to monitoring and evaluation.

Instruction should further develop a common definition and present examples of philosophy statements, goal statements, and program objectives, and how to establish priorities. Once the members involved in the process of revision have a common understanding of committee objectives and definition of terms to be used, the committee is ready to proceed to the developmental phase.

After the definition of committee tasks, each group leader should devote one or two meetings, giving everyone a chance to voice concerns. An appropriate question would be, "what are some of the things you think should be improved in our school system?" The group moderator should be prepared to let all members have sufficient time to answer it. This "clearing the air" process will prove extremely positive in future meetings. Although many concerns may be expressed, it is well for all school representatives to listen quietly and refrain from defending the school system. It is more important that concerns be aired completely in order to allow the process of revision to continue with all feelings in the open. It is also essential that all concerns be carefully documented, categorized, and distributed to each participant for future use in goal setting and eventual prioritization.

After the participants in each group have been given the opportunity to express their concerns freely, the next logical question to be asked is "what are some of the things about our schools that you like?" The same procedures should be followed as outlined for expressing, documenting, and categorizing and distributing. A carefully developed outline of school strengths for future use in goal setting and prioritization should be prepared and distributed to each participant.

With concerns and strengths of the school program categorized and placed in the hands of participants, each group should then be divided into small groups of six to ten people. These small groups will discuss at length the goal categories provided to each group by the district administration. Most districts have previously developed goals, and others may be obtained from state departments of education, state school boards, and teacher associations. The participant should familiarize himself with all statements and discuss them with fellow committee members during the meeting and with friends and neighbors during the week. Students will follow the same procedure during their daytime group meetings and with fellow students and parents at other times. If any participant believes there are other important educational goals not included in the list provided, he/she should immediately contact the group leader and have them added for group consideration.

After the period of discussion inside and outside the committee, members are ready for the next phase, the development of a statement of philosophy. It has previously been defined to the groups as a composite statement of the relationship between the individual and society based upon believes, concepts, and attitudes from which the goals and objectives of the district are derived. Examples should be given, such as: "We believe that our schools exist to provide a good program of general education to aid all students to become effective citizens in a democracy," and "We believe that schools should foster optimum individual development in various aspects of living such as mental, physical, social, and moral growth." It should be pointed out that the statement developed must be representative of the entire group, as concise or diversified as they want it to be.

At this point, all participants really become involved in the revision process. They become deeply committed to the development of a statement which truly represents the beliefs, concepts, and attitudes of the entire group.

Once the statement of philosophy has been written and accepted by the group, they begin the tasks of ranking and prioritizing the goal statements previously provided and discussed. As with the statement of philosophy, each group will have had goal statements defined as statements of broad intent which are general and timeless and not concerned with a particular achievement within a specific time period. A proven and effective approach to goal ranking is outlined as follows:

1. Provide each participant with a complete set of goal statement cards with a separate goal and priority ranking scale on each card. (See figure 1.)

GOAL STATEMENT

To provide all students with the opportunity to develop an appreciation of music.

A.	Least Important	1	2	3
B.	Minor Importance	4	5	6
C.	Average Importance	7	8	9
D.	Very Important	10	11	12
E.	Top Priority	13	14	15

Figure 1

2. Each committee member independently ranks each goal by circling one of the three numbers beside the one major order of importance they feel that particular goal should be placed in. (This procedure gives them the opportunity to rank concerns and recognize strengths previously documented and categorized.)

3. After the individual has completed his ranking, he then takes his cards to the group chairman who tabulates and posts the overall results of the group rankings.

4. Each group then selects a given number of their committee to represent them at the districtwide revision committee meeting.

5. The districtwide committee (composed of parents and student representatives) then meets together, compares their statements of philosophy and goal-ranking results, and through discussion and another ranking procedure, if needed, arrives at a consensus.

6. The final philosophy and ranked goals are then taken back to each group where the districtwide consensus is reported and the agreement of the group obtained.

Translating Philosophy and Goals into Performance Objectives

Through the involvement process the community is now aware that the school district has statements of philosophy and goals; that the goals have been ranked in order of priority; and that in some instances, the goals have not been met as well as they should be.

The next step is perhaps the most crucial in the entire process. It is at this point that district teachers develop specific performance objectives written in measureable terms which will satisfy the community's need for evidence about student learning in relation to the stated educational goals and objectives. The measurement procedures must not only provide empirical evidence that the goals and objectives are being met, but they must rate the benefits of one program over another.

Designs for Evaluation

Continued and increasing demands have been made for educators to develop valid and reliable measures which would provide empirical data to justify proposed innovation and change. It has reached the point where "The common tendency to equate innovation with improvement must be countered by rigorously evaluating the effectiveness of every new instructional procedure, not to mentionthe need to evaluate existing procedures."[9] The designs outlined and discussed here have been adopted from Popham.[10] The names applied to each design are identical to those used by Popham.

For purposes of this discussion the following symbols will be used:

R = Random Samples

T = Treatment (instructional procedures)

M = Measurement

Unassessed Treatment

→ TREATMENT →

Although the Unassessed Treatment design is traditionally used by educators, it is a method which provides no empirical data to justify judgments about the effectiveness of an instructional program or procedures. Typically a teacher or administrator will implement a new instructional program and rely on his intuition as to its effectiveness. The teacher or administrator merely expresses personal feelings as to whether the program should be continued or dropped. Those who use this evaluation procedure avoid any pre- or posttesting which would indicate student growth. This method is obviously unacceptable from the viewpoint of anyone looking for empirical data to justify the use of an instructional procedure.

One-Shot Case Study

TREATMENT → MEASUREMENT

In the use of this design the new instructional treatment is initiated by the teacher or administrator. Attempts are made to measure student learning at the conclusion of the instructional sequence. Although this approach is more acceptable than the Unassessed Treatment, it is difficult to accept any findings obtained without a knowledge of the degree of learning possessed by the student prior to the instructional treatment, and also without comparative data from contrasting instructional procedures with another group. It is clear that the students could have either possessed the skills taught prior to the treatment, or could have learned as much, if not more, from another instructional procedure.

One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design

MEASUREMENT → TREATMENT → MEASUREMENT

Although this design provides a desired measurement of actual student learning gained from the treatment as compared with learning possessed before being subjected to the instructional procedure, we are unable to accept the results as empirical evidence of program success. We are still unable to determine whether the measured growth was the result of a superior treatment because we lack comparative data with another instructional procedure. The evaluations are still operating at the intuitive level in the evaluation of program effectiveness.

It is obvious that the three evaluation designs traditionally used by educators are not empirically sound. They are not a valid means of providing evidence which would justify the use of any program beyond the intuitive or personal feeling level. In the utilization of a research or evaluation design which would be statistically sound, great care must be given to the--

1. Establishment of a two or more group approach through which data may be obtained from contrasting treatments; and

2. Selection of two or more groups which will provide initial similarities between the groups.

In order to obtain the required level of similarities and group equivalence, statisticians recommend the use of randomization procedures. The assignment of pupils or classes (when large numbers are available) may be easily accomplished through the use of a table of random numbers. Such tables may be obtained from any text on statistics or may be purchased. A portion of a random table is listed below:

A Portion of a Random Numbers Table

23157	54859	01837
05545	55043	10537
14871	60350	32404
38976	74951	94051
97312	61718	99755
11742	69381	44339
43361	28859	11016

Popham describes the selection technique as follows:

> If the teacher first numbers his pupils from one to 45, he can then start checking any two digit column or row in the random number table and assign the first 15 numbers (between one and 45) to his first group, the second 15 numbers to his second group, and the remaining pupils to the third group. In this case if the teacher started at the extreme left two columns, he would first select pupil number 23 for group one, then pupils numbers 15, 14, 38, 11, and so on until 15 were selected.[12]

Because it is difficult to move randomly selected students around to different classes in public schools, the most effective procedure would be to use the classroom in the random sampling rather than the student. In this approach, the evaluator should randomly assign a selected number of classrooms (using the same random assigning procedures) to the new treatment and an equivalent number of classrooms as control groups.

We have discussed the randomizing procedures and recognized the empirical weakness and ineffectuality of the three traditional approaches to evaluation. We are now able to analyze two evaluation designs which may be used in the educational setting to provide the level of empirical data required to measure the effectiveness of innovations or proposed changes.

Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design

Group 1: R → M → T → M

Group 2: R → M → M

With the experimental and control groups being selected through the randomization process, the evaluator is now able to organize a design which is powerful, effective, and empirically sound. It may be noted from the design that the experimental groups are randomly selected (R), receive a pretest measurement (M), the instructional treatment (T), and a posttest measurement (M).

The control groups are selected randomly (R), but receive a pretest (M) and posttest (M) only. With this design the evaluator may make reasonable judgments as to the effectiveness of the new program (Experimental Group 1) as compared with the traditional program (Control Group 2). We then have statistically sound data upon which to base judgments of a given program as compared to another from an actual measure of student learning.

Posttest Only Control Group Design

Group 1: R → T → M

Group 2: R → M

The second of our statistically powerful evaluation designs is one which is "all too rarely seen in school research."[13] As outlines by the model the experimental class (Group 1) and the control class (Group 2) are randomly selected (R). In this design however, the evaluator does not give a pretest to either group. Group 1 is given an instructional treatment (T), while Group 2 receives no instructional treatment whatsoever. Each group is then given a posttest (M) which would reveal actual learning differences upon which the evaluator may justifiably defend judgment and decisions concerning program effectiveness. Popham states that, "even though school researchers may be reluctant to employ this design because of the two groups, be assured that the randomization procedure will take care of that problem satisfactorily."[14]

Traditional evaluation designs have not provided the educator, the parents, the students, or the community with reliable data which would justify change. If education is to truly become a joint effort among all segments of the community affected by proposed changes in curriculum, we must develop data through the use of powerful and statistically sound evaluation designs. These designs will provide data from which judgments made be made by all segments of the school and community relating to changes which are needed and valid.

We will meet the demands and needs for involvement through the development of curriculum which ensures participation from school board, administration, teachers, parents, students, and community. We will meet the demands for relevance through procedures which will allow all segments of the community affected by proposed changes to participate and provide input in the decision-making process. We will meet the needs for concise evaluation when we, as educators, are able to utilize statistically sound designs which will provide empirical evidence upon which our decisions for change are based. We will be able to assume full accountability for the actual learning of our students when we are able to provide proof that each instructional procedure introduced into the classroom is effective and actually provides measured student learning. It is only through the process of establishing true relevance that we will be able to meet the demands of the critics, and re-create the needed emphasis on the basics of reading, writing, arithmetic, arts and resources.

FOOTNOTES

1. Van Til, William (Ed.) Curriculum: Quest for Relevance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974, p.1

2. Butts, Freeman, R. The Education of the West. New York: McGraw Hill, 1973, p. 315

3. Goodlad, John I. The Changing School Curriculum. New York: Georgian Press, 1966, pp. 9-10

4. Zais, Robert S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976, p. 3

5. Ibid, p. 22

6. Popham, W. James. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975, p. 2.

7. Ibid. p. 3

8. Gallup, George H. "The Tenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60:33-45.

9. Popham, W. James. Simplified Designs for School Research. Inglewood, California: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967, p. 1.

10. Ibid, pp. 2-22

11. Ibid, p. 9.

12. Ibid, p. 9-10.

13. Ibid, p. 12.

14. Ibid, p. 13.